

REMARKS

I. Introduction

In the Office Action mailed on October 20, 2006, the United States Patent and Trademark Office (hereinafter "the Office") rejected Claims 1-3, 12-15, 17, 20-28, 32-36, and 38-65 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2004/0187074 to Keohane et al. (hereinafter "Keohane"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,073,121 to Brown et al. (hereinafter "Brown").

With this amendment and response, Claims 1-3, 12-15, 17, 20-28, 32-36, and 38-65 remain pending in this application, with Claims 1, 2, 3, 12, 15, 24, 25, 32, 49, and 60 being independent claims. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 and for the reasons set forth below, applicants request reconsideration and allowance of this application. Prior to discussing the reasons why applicants believe that the present invention is in condition for allowance, an Examiner's Interview Summary is presented.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 12-15, 17, 20-28, 32-36, and 38-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keohane, in view of Brown.

A. Independent Claim 1

In its amended form, Claim 1 recites:

A method in a computing system for highlighting links to web sites that are of interest to a user, comprising:

displaying a first web page requested by a user from a web site;

receiving an indication from the user that the web site is of interest to the user;

in response to the indication from the user that the web site is of interest to the user:

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206 682 8100

determining the identity of the web site from the URL of the first web page, and

storing an entry corresponding to the web site in a list of web sites of interest;

at a time after the storing, receiving a request by the user for a second web page;

identifying within the second web page a link that points to the web site specified by the stored entry in the list of web sites of interest;

modifying the second web page to indicate that the identified link points to a web site of interest to the user and a first indicator associated with the identified link, the first indicator representing content of the web site that corresponds to the identified link;

displaying the second web page as modified; and

in response to a change in the content of the web site that corresponds to the identified link, modifying the second web page to replace the first indicator with a second indicator associated with the identified link, the second indicator representing the change in the content of the web site.

Claim 1 recites a method for highlighting links to Web sites that are of interest to the user. The method specifically requires "in response to a change in the content of the web site that corresponds to the identified link, modifying the second web page to replace the first indicator with a second indicator associated with the identified link, the second indicator representing the change in the content of the web site," as recited in Claim 1.

Brown et al. fails to disclose a "second indicator representing the change in the content of the web site."

As the Office Action indicates, the primary reference, Keohane, fails to teach an indicator representing content associated with the Web site that corresponds to an identified link, or an indicator representing the change in the content associated with the Web site that corresponds to an identified link. Thus, Keohane also fails to teach "in response to a change in the content of

the web site that corresponds to the identified link, modifying the second web page to replace the first indicator with a second indicator associated with the identified link, the second indicator representing the change in the content of the web site," as recited in Claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Brown does not make up the defects of Keohane.

The Office Action relies on Brown for teaching "an indicator" that is associated with the identified link and that represents the content of the Web site that corresponds to an identified link. Further, the Office Action asserts that Brown teaches the indicator that is modified in response to a change in the content of the Web site. Simply stated, Brown does not teach or suggest an indicator which is modified in response to a change in the content of the Web page. Brown is limited to teaching a server which presents content (a selected Web page) with thumbnails of other Web pages associated with links contained within the selected Web page. A thumbnail in Brown is not modified in response to a change in the content of its corresponding linked page (Web page associated with links) once the selected Web page is displayed to the user.

For example, Col. 6, lines 26-35, of Brown state:

As a user selects a web page for viewing (step 605), a Domain or Proxy server (hereinafter referred to simply as server) **parses the user selected web page** for links to other web pages (step 610). While the web page is being sent to the user, the server checks a **cache for existing thumbnails** (step 615) and **prefetches linked pages not cached** (step 620). The server then generates thumbnails of linked pages that do not have an existing thumbnail in the cache (step 625). Next, **the server sends the thumbnails along with the rest of the web page to the user.** (Emphasis added)

As described in the above-cited passage, in Brown, the thumbnails are generated based on linked pages or obtained from a cache while the server is preparing the requested Web page. Moreover, the linked pages are pre-fetched from the database in order to generate the corresponding thumbnails. As such, thumbnails in Brown are obtained or generated on the

server while the requested Web page is being parsed, but before the thumbnails within the selected Web page are displayed to the user. Thus, a thumbnail (indicator) in Brown is not modified in response to a change in the content of its corresponding Web page (or Web site) while the selected Web page is displayed to the user.

The Office Action further asserts that "the invention" (Brown) "addresses the problem associated with broken links by displaying the change in content of the web site to the thumbnail" (Office Action, page 3). Applicants respectfully submit that Brown addresses the problem associated with broken links by providing an indication whether the link is still good, or whether the link contains an excessive quantity of broken links within it. The server in Brown "determines whether each web page contains an excessive number of broken links" and alters a display "in some manner to **indicate that the web page associated with that particular link contains an excessive number of broken links**" (emphasis added) (Brown, Col. 9, lines 43-65). This is done while the server is parsing the selected Web page for links to other Web pages in order to provide the user with such indication. However, this indication generation has nothing to do with modifying a thumbnail in response to changes in the content of the linked page (the Web page which the thumbnail represents). Further, in Brown, once the selected Web page and thumbnails are generated and sent to the user, the server does not dynamically modify either the selected Web page or the thumbnails.

Thus, Brown also fails to teach or suggest "in response to a change in the content of the web site that corresponds to the identified link, modifying the second web page to replace the first indicator with a second indicator associated with the identified link, the second indicator representing the change in the content of the web site," as recited in Claim 1. Under § 103, a prima facie case of obviousness is established only if the cited references, alone or in

combination, teach each of the limitations of the recited claims. In re Bell, 991 F.2d 781 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

For these reasons, Keohane and Brown, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each limitation recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 is now allowable and request a withdrawal of the § 103 rejection.

B. Dependent Claim 52

Claim 52 is dependent on Claim 1 and, thus, allowable for the reasons discussed above in connection with Claim 1. Claim 52 also includes a myriad of recitations not disclosed, taught, or suggested by any of the cited and applied references, particularly when the recitations are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1 from which this claim depends. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request a withdrawal of the § 103 rejection with respect to Claim 52.

C. Independent Claim 2

In a similar manner to Claim 1, Claim 2 is directed to a method for identifying links to Web sites that are of interest to a user. As claimed in Claim 2, the method specifically recites "in response to a change request from the web site that corresponds to the identified link, modifying the second web page to replace the first indicator with a second indicator associated with the identified link, the second indicator representing a change in the content of the web site."

For reasons similar to those stated with regard to Claim 1, Keohane and Brown, alone or in combination, fail to disclose the above mentioned element as recited in Claim 2. Thus, applicants respectfully submit that that amended Claim 2 is allowable and request a withdrawal of the § 103 rejection.

D. Independent Claim 3

In a similar manner to Claims 1 and 2, Claim 3 recites a method for identifying links to Web sites that are of interest to a user. As claimed in Claim 3, the method specifically recites "modifying the web page to identify the link as pointing to a web site of interest, the link being attached to at least one indicator for the web site" and "configuring the at least one indicator to be modifiable while the requested web page is being displayed." Further, the method recites "the at least one indicator is indicative of content targeting the user, the content being obtained from the web site of interest." For reasons similar to those stated above with regard to Claim 1, Keohane and Brown, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest "an indicator" that is "modifiable while the requested web page is being displayed" and that is "indicative of content targeting the user, the content being obtained from the web site of interest," as recited in Claim 3. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that Claim 3 is allowable and request a withdrawal of the § 103 rejection with respect to Claim 3.

E. Dependent Claims 53-56

Claims 53-56 are dependent on Claim 3 and, thus, are allowable for the reasons discussed above in connection with Claim 3. Claims 53-56 also include a myriad of recitations not disclosed, taught, or suggested by any of the cited and applied references, particularly when the recitations are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 3 from which these claims depend. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request a withdrawal of the § 103 rejection with respect to Claims 53-56.

F. Independent Claim 12

In a similar manner to Claim 1, Claim 12 recites a method for processing a Web site that includes identified links to Web sites that are of interest to a user. As claimed in Claim 12, the method specifically recites "the web page including at least one indicator corresponding to

content of the part of the web site indicated to be of interest; and wherein the at least one indicator is dynamically changeable based on the content of the part of the web site."

For reasons similar to those stated above with regard to Claim 1, Keohane and Brown, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the at least one indicator that is dynamically changeable based on the content of the part of the Web site as recited in Claim 12. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that Claim 12 be allowable and request a withdrawal of the § 103 rejection with respect to Claim 12.

G. Dependent Claims 13-14 and 57-58

Claims 13-14 and 57-58 are dependent on Claim 12 and, thus, allowable for the reasons discussed above in connection with Claim 12. Claims 13-14 and 57-58 also include a myriad of recitations not disclosed, taught, or suggested by any of the cited and applied references, particularly when the recitations are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 12 from which these claims depend. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request a withdrawal of the § 103 rejection with respect to Claims 13-14 and 57-58.

H. Independent Claim 15

In a similar manner to Claim 1, Claim 15 recites a method for tracking Web sites. As claimed in Claim 15, the method specifically recites "attaching a dynamic indicator to the displayed link" and "the dynamic indicator represents content from the identified web site and changes in response to any change in the content while the link to the web page is being displayed." For reasons similar to those stated above with regard to Claim 1, Keohane and Brown, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest "attaching a dynamic indicator to the displayed link; and wherein the dynamic indicator represents content from the identified web site and changes in response to any change in the content while the link to the web page is being

displayed." Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that Claim 15 is allowable and request a withdrawal of the § 103 rejection with respect to Claim 15.

I. Dependent Claims 17, 20-23, and 59

Claims 17, 20-23, and 59 are dependent on Claim 15 and, thus, are allowable for the reasons discussed above in connection with Claim 15. Claims 17, 20-23, and 59 also include a myriad of recitations not disclosed, taught, or suggested by any of the cited and applied references, particularly when the recitations are considered in combination with the recitations of the claims from which these claims depend. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request a withdrawal of the § 103 rejection with respect to Claims 17, 20-23, and 59.

J. Independent Claim 24

In a similar manner to Claim 1, Claim 24 recites a computer-readable medium whose contents cause a computing system to track Web sites. As claimed in Claim 24, the computer-readable medium specifically recites "identifying and displaying a first indicator for the link, the first indicator being indicative of advertising content of the identified web site" and "updating the first indicator with a second indicator in response to a change in the advertising content while the link to a web page associated with the identified web site is displayed in the browser window, the second indicator representing the change in the content of the web site."

For similar reasons as stated above with regard to Claim 1, Keohane and Brown, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest "updating the first indicator with a second indicator in response to a change in the advertising content while the link to a web page associated with the identified web site is displayed in the browser window, the second indicator representing the change in the content of the web site." Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 24 is allowable and request a withdrawal of the § 103 rejection with respect to Claim 24.

K. Independent Claim 25

In a similar manner to Claim 1, Claim 25 recites a system for storing and tracking user activities in Web sites. As claimed in Claim 25, the system recites "display[ing] a visual indicator, the visual indicator being dynamically modified to represent a promotion offer from the web site identified by one of the entries," which Keohane, in view of Brown, fails to teach. For the similar reasons as so stated above with regard to Claim 1, Keohane and Brown, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each limitation recited in Claim 25. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that Claim 25 be allowable and request a withdrawal of the § 103 rejection with respect to Claim 25.

L. Dependent Claims 26-28

Claims 26-28 are dependent on Claim 25 and, thus, are allowable for the reasons discussed above in connection with Claim 25. Claims 26-28 also include a myriad of recitations not disclosed, taught, or suggested by any of the cited and applied references, particularly when the recitations are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 25 from which these claims depend. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request a withdrawal of the § 103 rejection with respect to Claims 26-28.

M. Independent Claim 32

Claim 32 recites a method for analyzing a search result comprised of a set of entries, each corresponding to a Web site in a similar manner to Claim 1. As claimed in Claim 32, the method specifically recites "adding to the entry an icon representing content related to the web site to which the entry corresponds, the icon being updated after negotiating with the web site with respect to the content," which Keohane and Brown fail to teach. Accordingly, Claim 32 should be allowable and the § 103 rejection with respect to Claim 32 be removed.

N. Dependent Claims 33-36 and 38-48

Claims 33-36 and 38-48 are dependent on Claim 32 and, thus, are allowable for the reasons discussed above in connection with Claim 32. Claims 33-36 and 38-48 also include a myriad of recitations not disclosed, taught, or suggested by any of the cited and applied references, particularly when the recitations are considered in combination with the recitations of the claims from which these claims depend. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request a withdrawal of the § 103 rejection with respect to Claims 33-36 and 38-48.

O. Independent Claim 49

Claim 49 recites a method for selectively presenting promotional offers with respect to a subject Web site. As claimed in Claim 49, the method specifically recites "in response to receiving the user input, displaying a promotional offer for the subject web site; wherein the promotional offer is represented via a visual indicator which is modified in response to a change in the promotional offer." For similar reasons as stated with regard to Claim 1, Keohane and Brown, alone or in combination, fail to disclose that "the promotional offer is represented via a visual indicator which is modified in response to a change in the promotional offer." Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that Claim 49 is allowable and request a withdrawal of the § 103 rejection with respect to Claim 49.

P. Dependent Claims 50-51

Claims 50-51 are dependent on Claim 49 and, thus, are allowable for the reasons discussed above in connection with Claim 49. Claims 50-51 also include a myriad of recitations not disclosed, taught, or suggested by any of the cited and applied references, particularly when the recitations are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 49 from which these claims depend. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request a withdrawal of the § 103 rejection with respect to Claims 50-51.

Q. Independent Claim 60

Claim 60 recites a method for displaying a Web page with a visual indicator related to content of Web sites that are of interest to a user. As claimed in Claim 49, the method specifically recites "obtaining information relating to the web site that corresponds to the identified link; and wherein during the display of the modified web page, the visual indicator is updated to represent the obtained information." For reasons similar to those stated with regard to Claim 1, Keohane and Brown, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest "during the display of the modified web page, the visual indicator is updated to represent the obtained information." Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that Claim 60 is allowable and request a withdrawal of the § 103 rejection with respect to Claim 60.

R. Dependent Claims 61-65

Claims 61-65 are dependent on Claim 60 and, thus, are allowable for the reasons discussed above in connection with Claim 60. Claims 61-65 also include a myriad of recitations not disclosed, taught, or suggested by any of the cited and applied references, particularly when the recitations are considered in combination with the recitations of the claims from which these claims depend. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request a withdrawal of the § 103 rejection with respect to Claims 61-65.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, applicants submit that all pending claims are in patentable condition and respectfully request an early notice to that effect. The Examiner is requested to contact applicants' attorney at the number provided below should any questions or issues remain.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sunah K. Lee', is written over the printed name of the attorney.

Sunah K. Lee
Registration No. 53,198
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1650

SKL:lal

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206 682 8100